

REMARKS

5 Claims 1-28 remain pending in the subject Application. In the Office Action dated 02/27/2002 ("Office Action"), claims 1-28 were rejected. In the amendment set forth above, Claims 1, 5-7, and 25 are amended, and Claims 2-4, 8-24 and 26-28 are unchanged. In view of the amendments set forth above, and the arguments presented below, it is respectfully requested the rejections to the Claims have been overcome, and an Early Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ARGUMENTS

1. Claims 1-28 are pending in the subject Application.

5 2. Applicants' Representative acknowledges approval of the formal drawings.

3. Claims 1-12 and 24 were rejected under 34 USC §112 second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. In particular, "responding to selection of one of said methods" in Claim 1, line 11, is said to lack proper antecedent basis because only a single method is referenced in Claim 1, line 9.

Claim 1 as originally presented is as follows:

15 "responding to selection of a first of the data objects present in said list to generate a second graphical interface display on said device of at least a portion of the contents of said first of the data objects together with a display of a plurality of selectable regions, each of said regions representing a first method executable on said first data object;"
(Claim 1, lines 6-10.)

20 The Claim, as originally presented, was intended to describe multiple regions of a graphical interface display, with *each* of these regions representing a respective first method executable on a first data object. (This aspect of Applicants' invention is discussed on page 9, lines 7-9, of Applicants' Specification, and is illustrated in Figure 5, for example.) It will be appreciated that in this type of configuration,
25 multiple methods are possible. It will further be noted that the term "first" was selected to indicate a *type* of method that is executable on the first objects, and was not intended to indicate any particular *number* of methods executing within the system.

30 To further clarify the language of Claim 1 so that it is consistent with the original intent, this Claim is amended such that each of the multiple regions

represents a respective method. Claims 5-7, which depend on Claim 1, are likewise amended to be consistent with this clarification. Additionally, Claim 25 is amended in a similar manner to incorporate the clarification. With these clarifications, Claims 1 and 25 comply with the requirements of 35 USC §112, paragraph 2, and this rejection should be withdrawn.

4. Claims 1-28 were rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,603,034 to Swanson ("Swanson"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Turning first to the language of Claim 1, it is believed that Swanson does not anticipate this Claim for at least the following reasons:

a.) First, Applicants' Claim 1 describes a method for executing on a "special device". Special devices are defined within Applicants' Specification as follows:

"At the same time, data processing and computer capabilities are being built into numerous special devices such as cell phones, palm tops, set tops, and car-based GPS computers. Thus, special devices are of a kind whose primary role is not thought of as full scale computing, in contrast to lap-top computers and personal computers." (Applicants' Specification page 2, lines 16-20.)

It has long been held that a definition of this nature provided in the Specification is to be used in interpreting a claim in accordance with the meaning intended by an inventor. *Beachcombers, International Inc. v. WildeWood Creative Products, Inc.*, 31 USPQ 2d 1653 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

In contrast to Applicants' Claim 1, Swanson describes a graphical editor in a digital processing system, as illustrated in Figure 1. (Swanson column 4, lines 60-64.) Swanson describes the digital processing system as follows:

"The data processing system may be selected from any of a number of *conventional processor devices* including, but not limited to, processors commonly found in that class of data processing apparatus known as work

stations." (Swanson column 5 lines 6-9, emphasis added.)

Those skilled in the art will readily appreciate that the type of data processing system described in Swanson is *not* a special processing device that performs a task other than full-scale computing. Instead, the system of Swanson is a
5 *conventional* processor such as a *workstation*. For at least this reasons, Swanson does not anticipate, nor even begin to suggest, the method of Applicants' Claim 1 that is adapted for use with a special device.

b.) Next, the meaning of "data objects" as claimed by Applicants' Claim 1 is considered. The Examiner states that Applicants' step of displaying a list of data
10 objects is taught by Swanson's displaying a list of selectable resource category objects. (See Office Action page 3, paragraph 6.) It appears the Examiner is correlating Applicants' data objects to the Swanson resource category objects, or "resource descriptors" 950, discussed in detail in Swanson column 10. If this is an incorrect understanding of the rejection, and this rejection is not withdrawn,
15 clarification is respectfully requested.

While it is true that the Swanson resource descriptors are "objects" as that term is used within Swanson, these objects are not of the type contemplated by Applicants' Specification. Applicants' objects are defined "...as data to be retrieved and subjected to [a] method in a script." These objects may include data stored in
20 different types of database systems or other data containers. (Specification page 2, lines 13-15 and 26-27.) This is in stark contrast to the Swanson definition of "object", which is as follows:

"An interface object, such as a menu selection item, is a graphics-and/or text-based image that signifies information, function, and/or data entry.

25 Such objects include push buttons, scroll bars, dials sliders and many other graphical indicia." (Swanson column 1 lines 28-30.)

To summarize, the term "data objects" of Claim 1 refers to data (such as sales data) that may be retrieved and subjected to a method. In contrast, the Swanson object is graphical indicia (such as a button) on a display screen. Based
30 on this latter Swanson definition, it may be readily appreciated that Swanson does

not teach or suggest Applicants' steps of displaying a list of data objects, then executing a method upon a selected data object (Claim 1, lines 3 and 11-12). While it is conceivable that you may use a Swanson graphical object to accomplish some type of task such as selecting a color, it is hard to imagine how you would *execute a method on* a selected one of the *objects (graphical indicia)* itself. For this additional reason, this rejection is improper, and should be withdrawn.

c.) Additionally, Swanson does not teach, or even suggest, Applicants' step of responding to selection of a first of the data objects.

In Applicants' system, a list of data objects is displayed for a user. A user then selects one of the data objects. In response to this selection, a display menu having corresponding selectable regions is presented to the user, wherein each of the regions relates to a corresponding method. Selection of a region (as by touching a portion of a touch-screen) results in execution of the corresponding method on the selected data object. (Claim 1, lines 6-12.) This is discussed, for example, in reference to Applicants' Figure 5, which shows the "sort", "search", and "compute" methods being displayed in response to selection of the "sales" object. (See Applicants' Specification page 8, line 15 through page 9, line 9.)

For purposes of this analysis, the Examiner's correlation between Applicants' objects and the Swanson resource descriptors objects will be used for discussion purposes, even though it is believed to be inaccurate for the reasons discussed above. According to the Examiner's correlation, Applicants' step of responding to selection of the first data objects is illustrated in Swanson's Figure 6. In that figure, selection of the resource category "General" in box 920 results in display of the selectable resource category objects 950. For each of these objects, a *single* corresponding resource value selection object 970 is displayed to allow a user to select the resource value for the corresponding resource category object. (Swanson column 10 and column 11, lines 1-3.)

It will be noted from Swanson Figure 6 that only a *single* resource value selection object is provided for a particular resource category object. For example, for the "bottom shadow color" object 950, only the single "colors" screen region is

provided to allow for color selection. In contrast to this Swanson system, Applicants' system provides a plurality of selectable screen regions for any selected object. Each region represents a method ("search", "sort", "compute") that may be executed on the selected object. Thus, the Swanson system does not teach, or even suggest, Applicants' amended step of "responding to selection of a first of the data objects...to generate a second graphical interface display...with a display of a plurality of selectable regions, each of said regions representing a respective method executable on said first object" as claimed by Applicants' Claim 1. For at least this additional reason, Swanson does not teach or suggest Applicants' Claim 1, and this rejection should be withdrawn.

d.) Finally, Swanson does not teach or suggest Applicants' step of responding to *selection* of one of the methods to *execute* that method on the selected data object. As noted above, no actual *selection of methods* occurs in Swanson because only one corresponding resource value selection object 970 is provided for any given resource category object. Moreover, each of the Swanson objects corresponds to graphical items on a display screen, and Swanson does not teach *executing* any type of method *on* these graphical items. Rather, Swanson teaches using these items to perform a manual editing process involving selection of a parameter value. For both of these reasons, Swanson does not teach Applicants' step of executing a method upon a first data object, and this rejection should be withdrawn.

Turning now to a discussion of Claims 2-12, these Claims depend from Claim 1, and are allowable over the current rejection for the reasons set forth with respect to Claim 1. In addition, these Claims include other aspects of the invention not taught or suggested by Swanson as follows:

Claim 2 describes a "point and touch operation" corresponding to a touch screen. (See Applicants' Specification page 8, line 3.) This is in contrast to the "point-and-click" interface described in Swanson. (Swanson column 1, line 35, as

cited by the Examiner.) For this additional reason, Swanson does not appear to teach or suggest Applicants' Claim 2.

5 Claim 3 describes a second method executed on a first result. It will be recalled from the foregoing discussion that the first result was obtained from executing the first method on a selected data object. As noted above, Swanson does not teach execution of a first method on a Swanson object, since the Swanson objects are graphical indicia on a display screen. Ergo, no "first result" is generated, and no second method is performed. For at least this additional reason, Swanson
10 does not teach or suggest Applicants' Claim 3.

It may be noted that in the Office Action, the Examiner cites the Swanson parsing of the app-custom file as teaching this second method. However, this Swanson parsing step is performed on the app-custom file, and not on any *result* that came from *executing a method on a resource category object*. Therefore this
15 method of Swanson does not appear to correspond to Applicants' method that is executed on the first result. If this rejection is not withdrawn, additional clarification regarding the significance of the parsing operation is requested.

Claim 4 describes each of the methods as comprising a transaction. The
20 results of each transaction are sequentially displayed, and become the basis for the next operation in the sequence of transactions. As noted above, no methods, transactions or otherwise, are performed on the Swanson objects, which are graphical indicia on a display screen. For the foregoing additional reason, Swanson does not teach or suggest Applicants' Claim 4.

25 The Examiner cites column 5, line 58 through column 6, line 21 as teaching this aspect of Applicants' invention. The cited passage appears to describe libraries of routines that may be called by client applications for constructing graphical user interfaces. The perceived significance of this passage is not understood, and clarification is respectfully requested if this rejection is maintained.

30

Claims 5-12 relate to particular aspects of the various methods executable on Applicants' data objects. Since Applicants' data objects, and the methods performed thereon, are not in any way taught or suggested by the graphical indicia of Swanson, it follows that the particulars of Claims 5-12 are likewise not taught by Swanson. For these additional reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 5-12 are allowable over this rejection, which should be withdrawn.

5. Independent method Claim 13 includes aspects that are similar to those discussed above in reference to Claim 1 above. For similar reasons to those set forth above, Claim 13 is allowable over this rejection, which should be withdrawn. Claims 14-22 depend, directly or indirectly, on Claim 13, and are likewise allowable over this rejection.

6. Independent apparatus Claim 23 includes aspects that are similar to those discussed above in reference to Claim 1, and is allowable over this rejection for reasons similar to those set forth above. Claim 24 depends from Claim 23, and is likewise allowable over this rejection.

7. Independent apparatus Claim 25 includes aspects similar in nature to those discussed above in reference to Claim 1, and is allowable over Swanson for reasons similar to those discussed above. Claim 26 depends from Claim 25, and is likewise allowable over this rejection.

8. Independent apparatus Claim 28 includes a storage medium encoded with program code comprising a graphical user interface for a special device. The code allows executing a sequence of transactions upon data on a screen display of the special device.

As discussed above, Swanson does not teach or suggest an interface for a special device as that term is defined by Applicants' Specification. Moreover, Swanson does not teach or suggest executing a sequence of transactions upon data

on a screen. For at least these reasons, Swenson does not teach or suggest the aspects of Claim 28, and this rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 29 depends from Claim 28, and is allowable over this rejection for reasons similar to those discussed above.

5

9. The references made of record and not relied upon have been reviewed and are considered to be of general interest only.

Conclusion

Claims 1-28 remain pending in the subject Application. In the Office Action, Claims 1-28 were rejected. In the amendment set forth herein, Claims 1, 5-7, and
5 25 are amended, and Claims 2-4, 8-24 and 26-28 remain unchanged. In view of the amendments and arguments presented above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections to the Claims have been overcome, and an Early Notice of Allowance is requested. If the Examiner has questions or concerns about this correspondence, a call to the undersigned is encouraged and welcomed.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth L. McMahon 05/23/2002

Beth L. McMahon
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 41,967
Tele No. 651-635-7893

Unisys Corporation
M.S. 4773
P.O. Box 64942
St. Paul, MN 55164-0942

BLM/clk

VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE

CHANGES MADE IN THE CLAIMS:

Claim 1 (Once Amended):

1 1. A method for executing methods upon data objects distributed across
2 a plurality of nodes of a system from a special device comprising the steps of:
3 providing a first graphical interface display on said device permitting
4 user selection of a data object category, selection of such category resulting
5 in display of a list of data objects available on the system;
6 responding to selection of a first of the data objects present in said list
7 to generate a second graphical interface display on said device of at least a
8 portion of the contents of said first of the data objects together with a display
9 of a plurality of selectable regions, each of said regions representing a
10 respective [first] method executable on said first data object; and
11 responding to selection of one of said methods to execute that method
12 upon the first data object and to display a first result of such execution on said
13 device.

Claim 5 (Once Amended):

1 5. The method of Claim 1 wherein one of said [first] methods comprises an
2 update of a record.

Claim 6 (Once Amended):

1 6. The method of Claim 1 wherein one of said [first] methods comprises a
2 summation of records.

Claim 7 (Once Amended):

- 1 7. The method of Claim 1 wherein one of said [first] methods comprises
2 selection of a record having a particular attribute.

Claim 25 (Once Amended):

- 1 25. An apparatus for executing methods upon data objects distributed across a
2 plurality of nodes of a system comprising:
3 a special device having a display associated therewith;
4 means providing a first graphical user interface on said display, said
5 interface permitting user selection of a data object category, selection of such
6 category resulting in display of a list of data objects available on the system;
7 means for responding to selection of a first of the data objects present
8 in said list to generate a second graphical user interface on said device of at
9 least a portion of the contents of said first of the data objects together with a
10 display of a plurality of selectable regions, each of said regions representing a
11 respective [first] method executable on said first data object; and
12 means for responding to selection of one of said methods to execute
13 that method upon the first data object and to display a first result of such
14 execution on said device.

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☒ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.